VOL 11 No 1 JANUARY 1981

SURVEY of Current Affairs

Government and Administration

Ministerial Changes 3
Northern Ireland: Hunger Strike Ends; Renewal of Emergency Powers 4
Britain's Associated States and Dependencies 5

External Affairs and Defence

North Atlantic Treaty Organisation 9
Britain and the United Nations 11
Shorter Notes 13
Greece Joins the European Community

Economic and Scientific Affairs

British Aerospace Limited 14
Posts and Telecommunications 14
Industry Bill 18
Shorter Notes 18
Heavy Goods Vehicles and the Environment; Family Expenditure Survey 1979; Taxation of Husband and Wife; Oil and Gas Licensing

Social and Cultural Affairs

Television 22

Documentation

23

Published for British Information Services by
Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London
Annual subscription including postage and index £18.60

The *Survey of Current Affairs* is produced for British Information Services overseas, but in response to requests has also been made available in Britain. Subscription and distribution inquiries should be addressed to Her Majesty's Stationery Office, P.O. Box 569, London SE1 9NH, and editorial inquiries to Reference Division, Central Office of Information, Hercules Road, Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7DU. Although the material is Crown Copyright, it may be reproduced without special permission.
Other documents produced by Reference Division if not on sale through Her Majesty's Stationery Office, may be obtained direct from Reference Division on payment of a small charge.

Ministerial Changes

A number of ministerial changes were announced on 5 and 9 January.

The new appointments to the Cabinet are as follows:

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Paymaster General and Leader of the House of Commons
Rt Hon Francis Pym, MC, MP (former Secretary of State for Defence)

Secretary of State for Defence
Rt Hon John Nott, MP (former Secretary of State for Trade)

Secretary of State for Trade
Rt Hon John Biffen, MP (former Chief Secretary to the Treasury)

Secretary of State for Transport
Rt Hon Norman Fowler, MP (former Minister of Transport)

Chief Secretary to the Treasury
Rt Hon Leon Brittan, QC, MP (former Minister of State, Home Office)

Other appointments are:

Home Office
Minister of State
Mr Patrick Mayhew, QC, MP (former Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department of Employment)

Department of Industry
Ministers of State
Mr Kenneth Baker, MP
Mr Norman Tebbit, MP (former Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department of Trade)

Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State
Mr John MacGregor, OBE, MP (former Lord Commissioner of the Treasury)

Civil Service Department
Minister of State
Mr Barney Hayhoe, MP (former Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence, Army)

Department of Employment
Parliamentary Under-Secretaries of State
Mr David Waddington, QC, MP (former Lord Commissioner of the Treasury)
Hon Peter Morrison, MP (former Lord Commissioner of the Treasury)

Ministry of Defence
Minister of State
The Viscount Trenchard, MC (former Minister of State, Department of Industry)

Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State
Mr Philip Goodhart, MP (former Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Northern Ireland Office)

Department of the Environment
Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State
Mr Giles Shaw, MP (former Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Northern Ireland Office)

Northern Ireland Office
Minister of State
Hon Adam Butler, MP (former Minister of State, Department of Industry)

Parliamentary Under-Secretaries of State
Mr David Mitchell, MP (former Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department of Industry)
Dr John Patten, MP

Department of Health and Social Security
Minister of State (Minister for Social Security)
Mr Hugh Rossi, MP (former Minister of State, Northern Ireland Office)

Department of Trade
Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State
The Lord Trefgarne (former Lord in Waiting)

Department of Education and Science
Minister of State (with responsibility for the Arts)
Rt Hon Paul Channon, MP (former Minister of State, Civil Service Department)

Lords Commissioners of the Treasury
Hon Robert Boscawen, MC, MP
Mr John Wakeham, MP
Mr John Cope, MP

Assistant Whips
Mr John Selwyn Gummer, MP
Mr Alastair Goodlad, MP
Mr Donald Thompson, MP

Lord in Waiting
The Lord Skelmersdale

The following Cabinet ministers tendered their resignations; their former posts are given in parentheses:

Rt Hon Norman St. John-Stevas, MP
(Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Minister for the Arts)

Rt Hon Angus Maude, TD, MP[1]
(Paymaster General)

Other ministers offering their resignations were:

Rt Hon Reginald Prentice, MP
(Minister for Social Security)

The Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal
(Minister of State, Ministry of Defence)

Mr James Lester, MP
(Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department of Employment)

Mr Marcus Fox, MBE, MP
(Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department of the Environment)

Mr Francis Pym whose appointment combines two previously separate posts – Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Paymaster General – will be Leader of the House of Commons.

Mr Norman Fowler as Secretary of State for Transport and Mr Leon Brittan as Chief Secretary to the Treasury will be members of the Cabinet. With 22 members, the size of the Cabinet remains unchanged. Mr Brittan has been appointed to the Privy Council.

The Cabinet

Following the new appointments, the composition of the Cabinet is as follows:

Prime Minister, First Lord of the Treasury and Minister for the Civil Service
Rt Hon Margaret Thatcher, MP

Secretary of State for the Home Department
Rt Hon William Whitelaw, CH, MC, MP

Lord Chancellor
Rt Hon The Lord Hailsham of Saint Marylebone, CH, FRS

Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs
Rt Hon The Lord Carrington, KCMG, MC

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Rt Hon Sir Geoffrey Howe, QC, MP

Secretary of State for Industry
Rt Hon Sir Keith Joseph, Bt, MP

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Paymaster General and Leader of the House of Commons
Rt Hon Francis Pym, MC, MP

Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Lords
Rt Hon The Lord Soames, CH, GCMG, GCVO, CBE

Secretary of State for Employment
Rt Hon James Prior, MP

Secretary of State for Defence
Rt Hon John Nott, MP

[1]It was announced that Mr Maude is to receive a knighthood.

Lord Privy Seal
Rt Hon Sir Ian Gilmour, Bt, MP

Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Rt Hon Peter Walker, MBE, MP

Secretary of State for the Environment
Rt Hon Michael Heseltine, MP

Secretary of State for Scotland
Rt Hon George Younger, TD, MP

Secretary of State for Wales
Rt Hon Nicholas Edwards, MP

Secretary of State for Northern Ireland
Rt Hon Humphrey Atkins, MP

Secretary of State for Social Services
Rt Hon Patrick Jenkin, MP

Secretary of State for Trade
Rt Hon John Biffen, MP

Secretary of State for Energy
Rt Hon David Howell, MP

Secretary of State for Education and Science
Rt Hon Mark Carlisle, QC, MP

Secretary of State for Transport
Rt Hon Norman Fowler, MP

Chief Secretary to the Treasury
Rt Hon Leon Brittan, QC, MP

Other Government Appointment

Following the resignation of Lord Mowbray and Stourton as Lord in Waiting in September, 1980, Lord Avon was appointed as his successor.

Northern Ireland

At the end of the hunger strike in the Maze Prison (see pp 311-13, 1980) the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland made a statement to the House of Commons on the position in Northern Ireland prisons. In a debate on the renewal of the emergency powers the minister referred to a decline in the overall level of violence in the Province.

HUNGER STRIKE ENDS

The Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Mr Humphrey Atkins, made a statement in the House of Commons on 19 December 1980 (*Hansard*, Vol 996, No 22, cols 1031-40) on the end of the hunger strike. He said that the seven Republican prisoners, who were in the fifty-third day of their hunger strike, had begun to take food. This included a prisoner who had been moved to hospital in view of his grave condition. In addition, every prisoner at the Maze had taken breakfast that morning.

This was most welcome news, said Mr Atkins. The hunger strike could not achieve its object, and it was encouraging that the influence of all those who sought to persuade the prisoners of that fact had finally been effective.

Mr Atkins said that he sincerely hoped that the same conclusion would be drawn by all prisoners, men and women, who had been protesting in the cause of political status, including the three remaining hunger strikers in Armagh Prison. [It was subsequently reported that the three women at Armagh who started to refuse food on 1 December had also ended their hunger strike.]

With the full support of the House, the Government had made it clear all along that it was not prepared to grant political status. The European Commission of Human Rights had considered and rejected the case for political status made to it by the protesters. It had asked the Government to keep the humanitarian aspects of the prison regime under continuing review, and the Government had responded positively with the changes in the spring and summer (see p 312, 1980). That remained in every particular the Government's position. The previous day he had sent into the Maze and Armagh prisons a summary which set out what would happen when the 'dirty protest' ended. A copy of this, which he would repeat in a broadcast to the people of Northern Ireland later that day, had been given to every protesting prisoner.

Minister's Broadcast

In his broadcast on what would happen when the protests came to an end, Mr Atkins said that prisoners would first be put into clean cells. Clothing provided by their families would be given to those discontinuing their protest and as soon as possible they would be issued with civilian-type clothing for wear during the working day. They would also immediately become entitled every month to eight letters, four parcels and four visits. They would be able to associate within each wing of the prison blocks in the evening and at weekends. The Government wanted to work out for each prisoner the kind of available activity which would suit him best – work, vocational training and educational training. Provision existed for lost remission to be restored after subsequent good behaviour.

Mr Atkins said that Northern Ireland prisons were acknowledged to include some of the best in the United Kingdom. The boards of visitors would continue to play their part in maintaining this position. Subject to the overriding requirements of security, the Government would continue to keep prison conditions under review.

RENEWAL OF EMERGENCY POWERS

On 10 December 1980 the House of Commons approved an Order to renew for a further six months the emergency powers contained in the Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act 1978 (*Hansard*, Vol 995, No 16, cols 1561–92). Opening the debate the Secretary of State spoke of the continuing decline in the overall level of violence in 1980. Compared with 1979 the number of deaths had fallen by a third and the number of injuries was substantially lower. Explosive attacks were down by a third and the number of shootings was lower than in 1979. The figures were still 'deplorably high' and each incident represented an intense tragedy for the victims and their families. The terrorists were no nearer achieving their objectives than they had ever been.

Mr Atkins said he had been especially concerned in recent months by the increase in the number of seemingly sectarian attacks. There should be no doubt that the security forces would continue to act impartially and resolutely against all who broke the law, whatever their political and religious persuasions. He was encouraged by the evidence of increasing acceptance by the minority community of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) as the legitimate upholders of the law and as a fair and reliable force they could turn to when necessary. The extension of normal policing, the growth in the size and capability of the RUC and the decline in the overall level of violence had allowed significant reductions to be made in the size of the Army. In the border areas the Army's strength was relatively greater and the RUC was working closely with its colleagues in the Irish Republic who had had notable successes recently.

Referring to the protest movement within the prisons, Mr Atkins said that this was one important arm of the strategy of the Provisional IRA. Its struggle to destroy law and order and overthrow democratic institutions in Northern Ireland continued inside the prisons. The protest was designed to contribute to its objective of securing political legitimacy for a movement whose only weapon was violence. It was also part of a wider attempt to discredit the measures the Government had been compelled to introduce to protect society from terrorism.

Mr Atkins acknowledged that the sections of the Act to which objection was most commonly taken were associated with the functions of the courts. In order to meet terrorist methods, variations from the normal had had to be introduced into the system, but there was no variation in the standard of justice. The Government was most conscious that these powers were temporary and in the circumstances prevailing in Northern Ireland could not recommend that any of the provisions should be allowed to lapse at the moment.

Britain's Associated States and Dependencies

Recent developments in Britain's Associated States and dependencies include the holding of a constitutional conference on independence for Antigua, the separation of Anguilla from St Kitts-Nevis, and the decision to convene a constitutional conference concerning Belize in order to bring it to early independence. Britain's commitment to Gibraltar has also been reaffirmed.

There are 14 remaining British dependent territories (including Anguilla). In most there is considerable self-government, with Britain having general responsibility for defence, internal security

and foreign affairs. British policy is to give independence to those territories that want it and not to force it on those which do not. There are particular problems associated with Belize, the Falkland Islands (see p 361, 1980), and Gibraltar which are the subject of territorial claims by neighbouring states – Guatemala, Argentina and Spain, respectively. In all three cases Britain refuses to accept that British sovereignty is in doubt. In Belize it is British policy, supported by the United Nations, to bring the territory to secure independence as soon as possible. In the Falkland Islands and Gibraltar, the inhabitants of both territories wish to retain the link with Britain, and the Government is pledged not to support any transfer of sovereignty against their wishes.

Two Caribbean territories (St Kitts-Nevis and Antigua) are known as Associated States, a status providing for control of internal affairs, with Britain retaining responsibility for external affairs and defence. Associated statehood is voluntary and can be terminated at any time by either party. Four former Associated States – Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines – have become independent in recent years.

ANTIGUA

A constitutional conference was held in London from 4 to 16 December 1980 as a preliminary to independence for the West Indies Associated State of Antigua. Following a general election in April 1980 the Antiguan House of Representatives requested in August the convening of a constitutional conference with a view to terminating the association.

The participants at the conference included the Antiguan Government, the Opposition and a delegation from the island of Barbuda which has been part of Antigua since 1860. Full discussion took place on the Antigua Government's draft constitution and a number of points of contention were resolved. Certain areas of disagreement remained, however, notably the Barbudan opposition to independence with Antigua without certain guaranteed safeguards. It was agreed that, taking account of the conference's decisions, the Antiguan Government would present a revised draft constitution to the Parliament in Antigua for approval. Once this was obtained it would propose a motion in that Parliament requesting Britain to terminate the status of association by Order in Council, a procedure followed in the case of the four Associated States that became independent earlier. In accordance with the West Indies Act 1967 the Order has to be approved by both Houses of Parliament to give effect to the Antiguan request. Although the Order will include a date for independence, this has not yet been fixed.

ANGUILLA

Legislation separating the Caribbean island of Anguilla from the Associated State of St Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla was approved by Parliament and became law in December 1980. The island's constitutional status becomes that of a British dependency with a British Governor. The population of Anguilla is 6,500.

Introducing the Anguilla Bill at second reading on 15 December (*Hansard*, Vol 996, No 19, cols 125-53), Mr Nicholas Ridley, Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, said that when the Associated State of St Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla was set up the people of Anguilla had not been prepared to accept a state with St Kitts and Nevis. Since all attempts to obtain a solution to the problem failed, the Anguilla Act 1971 had made provision for the administration of Anguilla by a British Commissioner (see pp 379-80, 1971). In December 1979 a solution was negotiated with the then Government of St Kitts-Nevis providing for the separation of Anguilla and progress towards independence for St Kitts-Nevis with special arrangements for determining the opinion of the inhabitants of Nevis about their future. The St Kitts-Nevis Government was defeated in a general election in February 1980, however, and the new Premier, Dr Kennedy Simmons, who formed a coalition with representatives of both St Kitts and Nevis, decided to leave the matter of Anguilla in the hands of the British Government. Mr Ridley pointed out that the people of St Kitts and Nevis were content that Britain should proceed in the way outlined and that there was consent in all quarters to the Bill.

Under the legislation Britain is empowered to make regulations for the constitutional advance of Anguilla. Mr Ridley said that, while the Government wanted to see Anguilla make constitutional progress, it was not the intention to proceed to full internal self-government since Anguilla wanted to remain a dependency. (Britain regards full internal self-government 'as a paving status before coming to independence'.) Any proposed constitutional changes would be debated in the British Parliament.

Commenting on help for the Anguillan economy, Mr Ridley said that in the current financial year (1980-81) a total of £1·09 million was being allocated in the form of grant-in-aid (£350,000), development aid (£540,000) and technical co-operation (£200,000). Britain recognised that it had a special responsibility for its small island dependencies and it was right that help should be given to develop infrastructure and productive enterprises. The Government would continue to aid Anguilla to the best of its ability 'within the limitations of the totality of the aid programme'.

BELIZE

On 2 December 1980 the Lord Privy Seal, Sir Ian Gilmour, announced in a parliamentary reply (*Hansard*, Vol 995, No 10, written answers, cols 161-2), that a constitutional conference would be convened in the near future with the intention of bringing Belize to 'early independence' in accordance with a resolution of the United Nations General Assembly passed on 11 November 1980. Sir Ian said that Britain's objective was to secure a negotiated settlement of the dispute with Guatemala, and a proposal for a further meeting

with Guatemalan representatives had been put to the Guatemalan Government.

Background

The Belize Government's desire for independence has been expressed many times since the dependency gained internal self-government in 1964. It has always been Britain's policy to bring Belize to independence as soon as possible in line with successive United Nations General Assembly resolutions; the achievement of this objective has, however, been hampered by the territorial claim on Belize by Guatemala. A further round of negotiations with Guatemala began in May 1980 to see whether a settlement of this long-standing dispute could be achieved.

On 11 November 1980 the United Nations General Assembly approved by 139 votes to 0 with 7 abstentions a resolution declaring that Belize should become independent before the conclusion of the Assembly's thirty-sixth session, that is, by 31 December 1981. Reaffirming 'the inalienable right of the people of Belize to self-determination, independence and territorial integrity', the resolution called upon Britain to convene a constitutional conference to prepare for the independence of Belize. It also urged Britain, acting in close consultation with the Government of Belize, and Guatemala 'to continue their efforts to reach agreement without prejudice to the exercise by the people of Belize of their inalienable rights' and called upon the parties concerned to respect the principle that threats or the use of force should not be applied to prevent the people of Belize from exercising their right to self-determination, independence and territorial integrity. The resolution requested Guatemala and an independent Belize 'to work out arrangements for post-independence co-operation on matters of mutual concern'.

For background information, see COI fact sheet, *Belize*, No 10/FS/80.

GIBRALTAR

Britain's commitment to the people of Gibraltar was restated in the House of Commons on 10 December 1980 by the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Mr Richard Luce (*Hansard*, Vol 995, No 16, cols 1593-602).

Mr Luce said that there were close ties between the British and the Gibraltarians and that there was no doubt about their strength and durability. The House as a whole admired 'the patience and fortitude with which the people of Gibraltar [had] lived with a closed frontier and all the inconveniences which that [caused]'. The Gibraltarians had prospered as a community under difficult circumstances and this was a testament to their resourcefulness and skills. The British commitment to Gibraltar was 'crystal clear' and had been reaffirmed in the April 1980 Lisbon agreement between Britain and Spain (see pp 110-11, 1980). In addition, it was enshrined in the preamble to Gibraltar's constitution which stated that the British Government would 'never enter into arrangements under which the people of Gibraltar would pass under the sovereignty of another state against their freely and democratically expressed wishes'.

Turning to the Lisbon agreement, Mr Luce expressed regret at its non-implementation and at the continued closure of the frontier with Spain. The British gates would remain open, and he hoped that the Spanish Government would realise that it was in Spain's interest, as well as in Gibraltar's and Britain's, that communications should be restored and confidence built up. The aim of the Lisbon agreement was to start negotiations aimed at overcoming all the differences between the British and Spanish Governments on Gibraltar and to re-establish direct communications in the region. Britain would certainly not start negotiations while the frontiers were closed.

Commenting on Spain's possible membership of the European Community, Mr Luce said that Britain supported Spanish accession and that this was 'a matter of importance to Britain and all Europe as well as to Spain'. Although stressing that Britain had made no formal link with the lifting of restrictions on Gibraltar, Mr Luce said that the restrictions had to go, and the border re-opened, long before Spain joined the Community.

Mr Luce then turned to the question of citizenship and Britain's proposed new nationality legislation (see pp 231-2, 1980). Present rights of access to Britain for Gibraltarians would not be affected by the new proposals; as United Kingdom nationals for European Community purposes, Gibraltarians had free access to Britain and all other Community member states for the purposes of seeking and obtaining work. There would be no question of Spanish nationals having easier access to Britain than Gibraltarians. In addition, the new nationality Bill would not affect the 1968 arrangements under which, in the context of Spanish restrictions, Gibraltarians are not subject to any form of British immigration control or to any restrictions on their residence or employment in Britain.

On defence, Mr Luce said that there was no doubting the strategic importance of Gibraltar, for its facilities enabled the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) to keep the Straits of Gibraltar under continual surveillance. One-third of NATO's oil supplies passed through the Straits, as did some 2,000 ships a month. Moreover, Gibraltar commanded the entrance to the Mediterranean through which all seaborne reinforcements and supplies of the southern flank of NATO in time of tension or war would have to pass. The defences of Gibraltar were kept under regular review.

Observing that the Gibraltar Government had commissioned a review of the port to consider its commercial prospects, Mr Luce said that Britain welcomed the idea that Gibraltar's commercial port should be developed.

For background information, see COI fact sheet, *Gibraltar*, FS1/79.

OTHER DEPENDENCIES

Information on the constitutional progress of Britain's other dependencies was given by Mr

Ridley in a parliamentary reply on 16 December 1980 (*Hansard*, Vol 996, No 20, written answers, cols 179-81). In this he said that talks were held in November 1979 with the then Government of the Turks and Caicos Islands and moves towards independence by 1982 had been agreed in principle. Just prior to the November 1980 general election, in which it was defeated, the Turks and Caicos Government had reconsidered its position and the new Government had expressed a preference for slower movement towards independence and had not proposed a date.

Mr Ridley explained that there had been contact from time to time with the Governments of some of the other dependent territories. Of these, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, St Helena and Tristan da Cunha[1] had expressed no wish for independence. Montserrat regarded independence as an ultimate goal, but had not expressed any desire for early moves in this direction. The Government of Bermuda was keeping the question under review and no discussions had taken place in the case of Gibraltar, Hong Kong and Pitcairn Island. Since Ascension Island had no permanent inhabitants, it would remain a British dependency.[1] The two other dependencies, British Indian Ocean Territory and British Antarctic Territory, also have no permanent inhabitants.

[1]Administratively, St Helena, with Ascension and Tristan da Cunha, form one dependency.

North Atlantic Treaty Organisation

Meeting in December 1980, members of the North Atlantic Council reaffirmed their determination to maintain the defence and deterrent capabilities of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and thereby to play their part in maintaining the basis for détente. At the same time they called upon the Soviet Union to refrain from interfering in the affairs of other states, and in particular urged it to withdraw its forces from Afghanistan and, along with all other countries, to leave Poland free to decide its own future. NATO's commitment to pursue effective measures for arms control and disarmament was reaffirmed.

The Council, attended by the foreign ministers of NATO's member states, met in Brussels on 11 and 12 December. The meeting was preceded by those of other NATO bodies, including the Defence Planning Committee and the Nuclear Planning Group.

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

Meeting against a background of growing uncertainty and tension in international relations, ministers expressed grave concern at the continuing military build-up of the Soviet Union; at its clear willingness, as seen in Afghanistan, to use force in disregard of the principles of the United Nations Charter, the Helsinki Final Act and international law; and at the Soviet menace which hung over Poland. Emphasising, therefore, that NATO's strength and cohesion were essential to the maintenance of stability and peace, they affirmed the determination of the Allies to meet any challenge to the freedom and well-being of their peoples and to make the efforts and sacrifices required for deterrence and defence. In this way they would do their part to preserve the basis for détente.

Détente and Poland

Genuine détente, ministers emphasised, had to be worldwide in scope and indivisible, and could succeed only if the Soviet Union strictly abided, in Europe and elsewhere, by the United Nations Charter and the principles of the Helsinki Final Act in their entirety. Allied efforts to persuade the Soviet Union to change its policy from one of intervention in the affairs of other states to one of respect for their sovereignty served the general interest of the international community. They would, therefore, keep open channels of communications and be ready to respond positively to concrete steps by the Soviet Union to cease aggressive activities and to restore the basis for constructive East-West relations. In this connection, they reaffirmed their commitment to the pursuit of effective, balanced and verifiable measures of disarmament and arms control.

Détente had been seriously damaged by Soviet actions, ministers continued, and would not survive if the Soviet Union were again to violate the basic rights of any state to territorial integrity and independence. Poland, they stated, should be free to decide its own future. The Allies would respect the principle of non-intervention and strongly urged others to do likewise. Any intervention would fundamentally alter the entire international situation, and NATO would be compelled to react in the manner which the gravity of this development would require. At the same time, genuine Soviet efforts to restore the confidence necessary for détente would meet with a ready response from NATO.

Berlin

Noting that the international situation was bound to be affected by developments concerning Berlin, ministers stressed the importance of maintaining the calm situation in and around that city and of not impairing the 1971 Quadripartite Agreement by unilateral action. Recent measures by the German Democratic Republic (see p 316, 1980) constituted a setback in the relationship between the two German states, and the Allies supported the efforts of the Federal Republic of Germany to secure the withdrawal of these measures in order to further relations between the two states in the interests of stability and co-operation in Europe.

Afghanistan

Noting that Soviet intransigence had prevented any progress towards a political settlement in Afghanistan (see pp 355-6, 1980), ministers re-emphasised that the Soviet occupation of that country was unacceptable, and called for a political settlement which would provide for the total withdrawal of Soviet troops and enable the Afghan people to exercise fully their rights of independence and self-determination. The Soviet action also had major implications for the whole

of South-West Asia – an area of paramount interest to the international community and the security of the Allies – and ministers stressed the readiness of NATO members to work for the reduction of tension in the area and, individually, to contribute to peace and stability for the region while protecting their vital economic and strategic interests.

Deterrence and Defence

In view of the enormous growth in the Warsaw Pact's military power, a development which contradicted the frequent assurances that its aim was not military superiority, ministers said that NATO countries would take, individually or collectively, the necessary defensive measures to meet this build-up and to deter any aggression. In addition, they would seek to strengthen the Alliance by continuing to pursue vigorously the practice of frank and timely discussions with a view to ensuring their solidarity on all matters affecting their common interests; and also allied programmes designed to strengthen the economies of NATO's less advanced members. Ministers also underlined, in the light of the situation in South-West Asia, the urgency of enhancing the defence posture of NATO's south-eastern flank and of maintaining stability and a balance of power in the entire Mediterranean region. They welcomed recent improvements in the Alliance's defence and deterrence capability in this area [for instance, Greece's re-entry into NATO's integrated military structure in October 1980 – see pp 310-11, 1980]. These also represented a welcome step towards the restoration of mutual confidence between Greece and Turkey.

Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe

Ministers reaffirmed their commitment to the process initiated by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) and to the continuation of this process beyond the present review meeting in Madrid (see pp 351-5, 1980). In condemning violations of the principles contained in the CSCE Final Act, like the invasion of Afghanistan and the suppression of human rights in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, NATO members were seeking to preserve the integrity of the Final Act to which they remained dedicated. In the same spirit, they were presenting in Madrid important new proposals in all areas covered by the Final Act, including human rights, human contacts and information. In the security area, the Allies strongly supported expanding and strengthening the confidence-building measures within a framework that ensured they would be militarily significant, verifiable and applicable to the entire continent of Europe, including all of the European territory of the Soviet Union. In this regard, ministers noted that the proposal of France concerning a mandate for a conference on disarmament in Europe, under the aegis of the CSCE, had been tabled in Madrid and had been welcomed by many delegations.

Arms Control and Disarmament

Reaffirming that the Allies would continue to seek agreements establishing greater security for all nations at lower levels of forces and armaments, within the United Nations framework and elsewhere, ministers stressed that such agreements had to provide for adequate verification. Such efforts were made more difficult if agreements already in force were not fully observed.

Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions

Ministers of those countries engaged in the negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions expressed their determination to achieve a more stable and equitable balance of forces in Central Europe through reductions, in two phases, leading to genuine parity in military manpower in the form of a common collective ceiling, based on agreed data. The Western proposal of December 1979 provided a realistic framework for a mutually beneficial phase 1 agreement involving United States and Soviet reductions and associated measures (see p 12, 1980). However, although the Eastern countries had recently made some limited moves towards an interim phase 1 agreement, they had regrettably still not provided the information necessary to reach agreement on the size of Soviet forces in Central Europe, an essential prerequisite to a phase 1 agreement. Nor had they responded adequately to Western proposals concerning associated measures which were designed to ensure verification of force reductions and limitations and to enhance stability.

Strategic Arms Limitation

Assuring strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union was central to the security of the Alliance, ministers stated. The Alliance, therefore, supported further negotiations and remained deeply committed to the strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT) process as a way of achieving mutual limitations on United States and Soviet strategic nuclear forces that would help enhance Western security and preserve East-West stability.

Theatre Nuclear Forces

Ministers representing countries party to the December 1979 decision on theatre nuclear forces (see pp 13-14, 1980) noted with satisfaction the serious and substantive character of recent discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union. [Preliminary talks between these two countries on long-range theatre nuclear forces (LRTNF) opened in Geneva in September.] They also expressed their support for the United States negotiating approach, this having been elaborated in intensive consultations among the Allies on the basis of the December 1979 decision. With regard to LRTNF modernisation, they noted that the Soviet preponderance in this area remained a cause for serious concern, and added that the SS-20 bases so far identified would support more warheads than were planned for in NATO's modernisation programme. Commenting that allied solidarity and support for both modernisation and arms control involving TNF remained a key to achieving progress towards agreed limitation, ministers said that NATO's LRTNF requirements would be examined in the light of the results of

the negotiations. The withdrawal of 1,000 United States nuclear missiles from Europe, an integral part of the December 1979 decision, had been completed.

DEFENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Defence Planning Committee met in Brussels on 9 and 10 December. Reviewing NATO's defence policy in the light of the continuing and substantial growth in the Soviet Union's military power and offensive potential, ministers expressed concern at the implications this had for the balance of forces between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Despite the slowdown in economic growth and increasing energy supply difficulties, Soviet defence expenditure still amounted to 11-13 per cent of gross domestic product and was growing in real terms by 4-5 per cent annually. In the past year all aspects of Soviet nuclear and conventional forces had been enhanced, including, in the theatre nuclear field, the deployment of SS-20 missiles (each with three warheads) at a rate of one per week, and the continuing production of Backfire bombers. No abatement in these programmes, the ministers added, could be foreseen in future years.

Against this background, ministers concluded that, despite progress in implementing the Long-Term Defence Programme (see p 251, 1978), the rate of improvement in NATO forces was insufficient, and they acknowledged that the persistence of present deficiencies could lead to a serious deterioration in NATO's deterrent posture. With this in mind, they adopted the NATO Force Plan for 1981-85 and reaffirmed the importance of member countries' achieving and sustaining the aim of real annual increases in defence expenditure in the region of 3 per cent.

Taking note of United States contingency plans for the deployment of its Rapid Deployment Force to South-West Asia, ministers agreed on the need to prepare against the eventuality of a diversion of NATO-allocated forces which the United States and other countries might be compelled to make in order to safeguard the vital interests of NATO countries outside the North Atlantic Treaty area. With regard to the effect this might have on NATO plans for the reinforcement of the European theatre, the ministers of the countries concerned affirmed their intention to provide host nation support to facilitate the reception and employment of reinforcement forces.

Reviewing progress in other matters, ministers expressed their support for the further strengthening of the defence posture of NATO's southern flank and of Portugal as part of the efforts taken to increase allied security in the light of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan; acknowledged the need for further assistance to be given to Portugal, Greece and Turkey in order for them to meet the minimum requirements of the 1981-86 force goals; and re-emphasised the importance of the parallel and complementary character of the December 1979 decision on modernisation and arms control with respect to long-range theatre nuclear weapons (see p 10). They also noted with satisfaction progress achieved in equipment collaboration, particularly within the Transatlantic dialogue, and welcomed the signature of a memorandum of understanding between Britain, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States on air-to-air missiles. They reaffirmed their support for the work of the Conference of National Armaments Directors.

NUCLEAR PLANNING GROUP

Meeting in Brussels on 13 and 14 November, ministers of the Nuclear Planning Group also noted recent developments in Soviet nuclear deployment and, against this background, pointed to the continuing importance of improving the effectiveness of the full spectrum of Alliance forces – conventional, theatre nuclear and strategic – and of maintaining the essential linkage between these elements of the NATO triad.

Agreeing that the recent force modernisation programmes and evolutionary refinements in the United States employment policy, known as the countervailing strategy, had enhanced NATO's strategy of deterrence by adding to the credibility and flexibility of its forces, ministers reaffirmed that United States strategic policy, in the context of NATO's strategy, remained the centre of an adequate deterrent to the threat posed by Soviet nuclear forces. They also agreed, following a briefing by Britain's Secretary of State for Defence that Britain's acquisition of the Trident missile system (see p 233, 1980) would make a significant contribution to enhancing the effectiveness of the NATO triad of forces. Recalling the Ottawa Declaration by Heads of Government in 1974, which recognised the contribution which British nuclear forces capable of playing a deterrent role of their own made to the overall strengthening of deterrence, they welcomed the British Government's intention to assign the new Trident force to NATO, as the Polaris force was at present.

Ministers also affirmed their belief in the importance of strategic arms limitation for improving NATO's security and expressed support for further negotiations covering both strategic as well as long-range theatre nuclear forces (see p 10).

Britain and the United Nations

Britain's support for the political, economic and social activities of the United Nations and its specialised agencies has been emphasised in Parliament.

The United Nations was near to being a universal institution, Lord Trethgarne, then a Government Whip,[1] told the House of Lords on 17 December 1980 (*Hansard* (*HL*), Vol 415, No 14, cols 1168-73), and, for all its imperfections, it was the parliament of the world. In this age of interdependence, every member state had to take the United Nations into account and seek to work through it in the search for solutions to the

[1]Now a Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the Department of Trade.

problems that beset the world. The institutions of the United Nations system were numerous and wide-ranging, and, against the background of the grave problems which the world community faced, the British Government was anxious to play a positive role in them whenever there was evidence of a general will to seek common ground and practical advance.

The Maintenance of Peace

Criticisms of the United Nations with regard to its prime original purpose, the maintenance of peace and the promotion of the peaceful settlement of disputes, were based on a fundamental misunderstanding, Lord Trethgarne stated. Whatever the powers ambitiously conferred upon the Security Council in 1945, it was not practical politics to expect the United Nations to impose solutions by coercive means. He continued: 'The Security Council – and the General Assembly, too – are committees of states, not supranational institutions, and their ability to act and to influence events is a function of the willingness of states to work out common positions and strive for common goals. If that will is not there, then it is the policies of the states concerned that should come under attack, not the forum in which they meet. To suggest that it is not worth their meeting, or having a United Nations at all, is a real counsel of despair. The United Nations provides means for the international community to inform, to persuade and to exert pressure. It provides an extra armoury of devices that diplomacy can use in the effort to avert conflict or to bring it to an end. As Churchill said, " 'Jaw-jaw' is better than 'war-war' ". Through the UN, "Jaw-jaw" can be made to continue beyond the point where the processes of the old diplomacy might have been exhausted.'

Britain wished to encourage such hopeful developments as the growth of United Nations peace-keeping[1] and the increasing willingness of governments to have recourse to the good offices of the Secretary-General. The recent trend towards informal consultation among Security Council members also had value. As a country which continued to have world-wide interests, and as a permanent member of the Security Council, Britain had both a need and a duty to contribute to the United Nations' work for peace, and would continue to play its part.

Arms Control and Disarmament

Turning to one of the key elements in the political work of the United Nations, the search for greater security through arms control and disarmament, Lord Trethgarne said that, while the search for balanced and verifiable measures of arms control was a painstakingly difficult one, no one should doubt the effort that was put into it, or the high priority the British Government attached to it. It was disappointing that there was so little to show for these efforts, but the fact was that arms control discussions, whether conducted under the auspices of the United Nations or elsewhere, could not be divorced from the wider political context: the prospects for agreements were closely related to renewed progress in building up international confidence and security. Nevertheless, the Government was committed to the search for multilateral arms control measures. Britain was a party to all the multilateral arms control treaties negotiated since 1945, and would continue to play a full part in the work of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva and in other disarmament fora. Britain had also strongly supported key bilateral negotiations, such as the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, and welcomed the statements by the President-elect of the United States, Mr Ronald Reagan, about the importance of continuing this process.

International Law

Another key role of the United Nations was its contribution towards the development of international law, and Britain's position as the source of one of the main legal traditions of the world made it appropriate that it should play a leading role in this sphere. Among the major achievements of recent years had been the codification under United Nations auspices of the Law of Treaties and the law relating to diplomatic and consular relations. Lord Trethgarne hoped also for an early completion to the comprehensive review of the International Law of the Sea, together with a new international regime for the deep seabed. Progress had been made at the last session of the Law of the Sea Conference on the composition and voting arrangements for the Council of the International Seabed Authority. The next session, due in March and April, would have to concentrate on the important issue of participation – which Britain hoped would be resolved so as to enable the European Community to be a party to the treaty – and on the preparatory commission and on preliminary investment protection.

Human Rights

The growing acceptance that, despite the provision of the United Nations Charter which ruled out interference by the organisation in the internal affairs of states, human rights questions were the legitimate concern of all members was another welcome development, Lord Trethgarne continued. It was satisfactory to note that in recent times such subordinate organs of the General Assembly as the Commission on Human Rights had been able to debate human rights subjects concerning various parts of the world without becoming ossified on ideological lines. There had also been some move away from the selectivity that had previously marred much of the United Nations human rights work. Britain and other like-minded countries had to play their part in using the United Nations system to promote the fundamental values on which not merely Western civilisation but civilisation in general had to rest.

Co-operation in the United Nations

In the United Nations, Britain attached importance to its close contacts and collaboration with Western and other countries which shared its interests and preoccupations. This was particularly true in

[1]Britain has consistently supported peace-keeping operations, and currently supplies the largest national contingent to the United Nations peace-keeping force in Cyprus, together with logistic support for the entire force. It also provides facilities and supplies for the United Nations interim force in Lebanon.

the case of the European Community whose member states sought to harmonise their political positions on all the problems that concerned them, not merely those that fell within the scope of the Treaty of Rome. Co-operation at the United Nations had been one of the most successful aspects of this effort. At the last General Assembly session Britain had joined in more than 300 meetings to harmonise Community attitudes, and a common voting position had been achieved on the great majority of the resolutions. The Community had already achieved a cohesion which was widely respected in the United Nations. Britain welcomed and would continue to foster this trend.

Specialised Agencies

The British Government, Lord Trethgarne emphasised, attached high value to the work of the specialised agencies which accounted for more than three-quarters of the resources of the United Nations system in terms of staff and funds. At the same time, it regretted the tendency for political matters, which were properly for the General Assembly, to be brought up in the agencies. It would continue to resist this, whatever view it might take of the political issues involved.

With regard to the question of a new world information order, which was both a political issue and also properly the concern of an agency, namely the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), Lord Trethgarne said that the British Government understood the wish of the developing countries to reduce their dependence on the Western media, and was willing to play its part in assisting with the training of journalists and the development of communications in developing countries. But it was determined to resist any further encroachment on the freedom of the media to gather and disseminate information; and it was determined to see that proper weight was given to the rights of individuals in UNESCO's negotiations, and not merely to the rights of countries, which was to say, governments. (See pp 317-20, 1980.)

Commenting on the work of other agencies, Lord Trethgarne spoke of the importance of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine, to which Britain had been the second largest contributor since its inception and was contributing £4·5 million in the current year; of Britain's support for the UN Fund for Population Activities, reflecting the Government's recognition of the importance of population programmes in the development process and its continuing efforts to provide assistance to such programmes commensurate with other priorities in the aid programme; and of its satisfaction that, with the imminent return of the United States to membership of the International Labour Organisation, that body's future as an effective forum for setting and maintaining international standards was no longer in doubt. The Organisation, with its unique tripartite structure of government, employers and workers, was, in a sense, the most widely representative of the United Nations institutions.

Lord Trethgarne also paid tribute to the World Health Organisation, particularly for its success in eradicating smallpox; to the work of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Children's Fund and the United Nations Development Programme, to each of which Britain had pledged, subject to parliamentary approval, increased contributions for 1981; and to the Food and Agriculture Organisation whose work of investing in food production programmes had to be supported if starvation was to be prevented.[1] Referring to the International Maritime Consultation Organisation, the only specialised agency to have its headquarters in Britain, Lord Trethgarne stressed its crucial role as a forum for negotiation on a large number of international conventions and for drawing up detailed recommendations and codes of practice over a very wide range of matters affecting ships. Its work was of fundamental importance to Britain both because it was a major shipping nation and because it had a coastline greatly exposed to the risk of marine pollution.

Finally, Lord Trethgarne pointed to the encouragement successive British Governments had given to British nationals to serve in the United Nations and its specialised agencies. At present, there were 123 Britons occupying professional, senior posts in the United Nations Secretariat compared with the 96 to which Britain was entitled under the complex formula for deciding equitable geographical distribution. Bearing in mind the intense pressure for such jobs, this was a measure of their quality. A similar proportion of Britons worked for the specialised agencies.

Shorter Notes

GREECE JOINS THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

On 1 January Greece became the tenth member state of the European Community, and the Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, sent the following message of welcome to the Greek Government: 'On the occasion of Greece's accession I welcome the people of Greece to membership of the European Community and to partnership in the enlarged Europe of ten. I believe that Greek membership will contribute to freedom and peace, European unity and social and economic progress to the advantage of all. Within the framework of the Community, ten countries of Europe can work together on our common problems and co-operate on the opportunities open to us for the future.

[1]Lord Trethgarne announced that Britain had just offered a further 30,000 tonnes of cereals to Somalia, Mozambique, Zambia and Kenya, all of which were facing serious food shortages. This was in addition to the 40,000 tonnes already supplied in 1980 to needy African countries through Britain's bilateral food aid programme. Britain was also paying 20 per cent of European Community food aid supplied as deliveries of cereals to African countries.

British Aerospace Limited

On 1 January all the property, rights, liabilities and obligations of British Aerospace were vested in its successor company British Aerospace Limited in accordance with the British Aerospace Act 1980 (see p 264, 1980). The company will now apply to be re-registered as a public company under the Companies Act 1980, its name being changed to British Aerospace Public Limited Company.[1]

Announcing this on 17 December 1980, the Minister of State for Industry, Mr Adam Butler, said that the Government intended at the earliest opportunity to offer for sale about half the shares in the company (*Hansard*, Vol 996, No 21, written answers, cols 271-4). Special arrangements would be made for employees to acquire shares. All eligible employees, including all employees in Britain with one year's service, would be offered – free of charge and at the Government's expense – shares of approximately £50 in value at the offer price, provided they agreed to vest them in the trustees of the British Aerospace Employee Share Ownership Scheme for at least two years. There would also be a matching offer of a limited number of shares under which all eligible employees who purchased shares and vested them in the trustees would receive an equal number of shares free. All the free shares would attract the tax benefits laid down by the Finance Act 1978, as amended by the Finance Act 1980 (see p 119, 1980), if they remained vested in the trustees for longer than four years. These special arrangements would be in addition to the usual preferential consideration that would be given to applications received from all employees to purchase shares at the offer price.

Mr Butler said that all the existing members of the British Aerospace board had been appointed as directors of the successor company. Immediately before the offer of shares for sale he intended to appoint two of the non-executive directors as government directors of the new company. However, while the company remained wholly owned by the Government, the Secretary of State for Industry would continue to exercise the same measure of control over investment and borrowing as had been applicable under nationalisation. A memorandum of understanding providing the basis on which such controls would be operated would be agreed between British Aerospace Limited and its directors and the Secretary of State before vesting and laid before the House of Commons.

Mr Butler also outlined the arrangements he had made concerning the future capital and reserves of the company. With the consent of the Treasury he had given a direction under the British Aerospace Act 1980 that the company should, as a consequence of the vesting, issue shares to the Secretary of State to bring its total issued share capital to £40 million in nominal value. Further shares would then be issued before or at the time of the offer for sale. He was satisfied that arrangements for limited remuneration of commencing capital would produce the best outcome overall for both the Government and the company.

[1]A Public Limited Company (PLC) is a public company registered under the Companies Act 1980 (see pp 341-2, 1979), its memorandum of association taking the form laid out in the Act.

Posts and Telecommunications

The British Telecommunications Bill, which establishes a new corporation to be known as British Telecommunications (BT) to operate telecommunications and data processing services, and provides a new framework for the structure of communications services in Britain, has received its second reading in the House of Commons. Prestel International, the first international public viewdata service, is to be inaugurated in July 1981 and the sixth overseas sale of Prestel (the world's first national public viewdata service) has been announced. Other recent developments in posts and telecommunications have included the go-ahead for a new global maritime satellite communications system, the launch of an international communications satellite with double the capacity of its predecessors, the start of a new public data communications service in Britain, and the announcement of an electronic mail service using advanced facsimile equipment.

BRITISH TELECOMMUNICATIONS BILL

Main Provisions

The Bill includes provisions for the separation of the Post Office so that it would no longer be

responsible for telecommunications. A new public corporation, British Telecommunications,[1] would run the telecommunications and data processing business of the Post Office. The Post Office's existing exclusive privilege of operating telecommunications systems would be transferred to BT, but the Secretary of State for Industry would have the power to license others to provide telecommunications services. The Bill creates conditions under which private firms would have a wider freedom to supply and install telecommunications equipment in competition with BT; the Secretary of State for Industry would have powers to approve standards for apparatus which might be attached to the BT network. The Bill sets out the powers of the Post Office with respect to the provision of postal and banking services and the performance of services for the Government and other authorities. It also sets out in a modernised form the exclusive privilege of the Post Office with respect to the conveyance of letters and specifies certain exclusions from this privilege. The Secretary of State for Industry would be able to license others to provide competing letter services and would have the power to suspend the monopoly entirely, either in a particular area or throughout Britain. The Post Office would be allowed, subject to ministerial approval, to provide services over post office counters on behalf of a wider range of public sector bodies. Borrowing limits, set at £5,000 million for BT and £1,200 million for the Post Office, may be increased by Order, subject to the approval of the House of Commons, to £6,500 million and £1,700 million respectively. The Bill would also allow the Government to dispose of any or all of its interest in Cable and Wireless Ltd (whose principal activity is the provision of telecommunications services in some 30 countries overseas on a franchise basis on behalf of their governments).[2]

Parliamentary Debate

The Bill received its second reading in the House of Commons on 2 December 1980 (*Hansard*, Vol 995, No 9, cols 205-330) by 303 votes to 234.

Government View

Opening the debate, the Secretary of State for Industry, Sir Keith Joseph, commended the Bill to the House 'as a substantial measure likely to bring noticeable and worthwhile benefit to those who work in the public and private sectors connected with telecommunications and to the public generally as consumers and users of telecommunications'. He said that the Bill's purpose was 'to allow a more flexible approach to the postal and telecommunications services by the private and public sectors'. Technological advances in telecommunications had made the concept of an absolute monopoly out of date; monopoly stifled the growth of services and the development of new equipment. He emphasised the Government's view that monopolies were 'not rights, but privileges which must be earned and re-earned every day'. There had been 'widespread, and often fully justifiable, public dissatisfaction with the operation of telecommunications and postal monopolies' and the quality of service was inadequate. The Government believed that the introduction of competition or the possibility of its introduction would bring 'increased benefits for the consumer and the economy generally'.

Sir Keith dealt with the split of the Post Office into separate corporations for the postal services and for telecommunications. He said that this had been under consideration for many years and had been recommended by the Carter Committee in 1977 (see p 354, 1977). Its argument had been that the two businesses were 'markedly different, one being capital – intensive and the other labour-intensive'. Each needed its own board to concentrate on running its business. He had announced in 1979 the Government's acceptance of these arguments (see pp 302-3, 1979). The Post Office had been carrying out the necessary preliminary arrangements and the separation was now largely prepared and, if the Bill were approved in Parliament, this would complete the process. Sir Keith noted that the Bill pointed the way to a 'much more flexible organisation, both for British Telecommunications and the Post Office'. As well as separating the functions of the present Post Office, it would 'also lead to the creation of new profit and self-accounting units which should be more responsive to the needs of customers'.

Sir Keith said that the Carter Committee had recommended that the boundary of the telecommunications monopoly should be redrawn and the Government believed the case for this to be 'unanswerable'. He pointed out that in the United States in the last 15 years there had been marked progress towards open competition in place of closely regulated local and national monopolies. Entrepreneurs there had gained freedom to develop new services and a wide range of equipment associated with telecommunications, and this had stimulated enterprises and benefited users.

Sir Keith said that the new corporation had 'a crucial role in providing a modern and efficient network and in applying the new technologies'. The Government's policy was that BT should be 'free to compete in all areas but that it should do so fairly and, as far as possible, on an equal basis with the private sector'. There was 'plenty of scope for both BT and for [the] private sector to play a full part, in some areas in competition, and in others working together in joint enterprises'.

The Government's role, Sir Keith said, was to provide a framework within which these developments could take place in response to market demand. There were 'three main objectives behind the Bill: first, to protect the interests of consumers; secondly, to stimulate the United Kingdom industry; and, thirdly, to promote greater flexibility of telecommunications systems'. The key was

[1]British Telecommunications will trade under the name 'British Telecom', and this trading name has already been brought into use (see p 249, 1980). Until the British Telecommunications Bill receives the Royal Assent and the new corporation is established, the formal title being adopted is 'British Telecommunications, part of the Post Office'.

[2]Cable and Wireless has been wholly publicly owned since 1946, although it operates as a private company. The Government is considering a sale of shares in Cable and Wireless as part of its policy of reducing the size of the public sector shareholdings.

'the introduction of competition over as wide a field as possible'. He then described how the Government intended to use the powers in the Bill. It would 'liberalise the supply, installation and maintenance of all equipment attached to the network with the exception of the subscriber's first telephone and the maintenance of private branch exchanges'. Technical approval of attachments to ensure compatibility with the network would be carried out by a self-financing independent body working to standards formulated by the British Standards Institution and approved by the Secretary of State. The Government intended to 'liberalise the use of the network for third party services' and would decide the extent of the liberalisation in the light of a study being carried out into the economic implications. The scope for licensing the provision of transmission services in competition with BT was being explored.

Sir Keith said that the telecommunications manufacturers, which in many of the major terminal equipment areas had been dependent on the Post Office as their main customer, had to have time to adjust to the new competitive conditions in order to resist successfully the challenge from imports of overseas manufacturers who had not been so constrained, and the Government therefore intended to phase in the liberalisation of attachments over a period of about three years.

The need for efficiency, the value of competition and the scope for innovation, Sir Keith said, applied equally to the postal service as to telecommunications. Accordingly, the Government had decided that certain changes to the exclusive privilege of the Post Office for the carriage of letters were needed: first, the exclusion of express mail from the monopoly; secondly, freedom for document exchanges to carry mail in bulk between city centres; and, thirdly, freedom for charities to deliver Christmas cards. He would seek powers to make further derogations in certain circumstances, for example, where the Post Office did not react adequately to new market demand or when industrial action seriously affected the service. The primary considerations would be 'performance and the interests of consumers'. He believed that the measures would have 'the effect of stimulating the Post Office to greater efficiency and thus rendering a better service to customers'.

Sir Keith said that the Bill empowered the Government to dispose of its shares in Cable and Wireless Ltd. That power was being sought in pursuance of the Government's general policy of disposals in the public sector. However, no final decision on the exercise of the power or on the timing or form of the disposal of shares would be taken until overseas governments directly affected by the company's operations had been fully consulted.

Opposition View

The Opposition's chief spokesman on industry, Mr John Silkin (now Shadow Leader of the House of Commons) said that the problem of getting the Post Office's organisation working over the next three years and providing an efficient service would be 'more than enough to cope with ... without bothering about anything else'. That was an argument for retaining the monopoly. Successive governments had agreed that the postal service should be a monopoly. The great quality of the postal service, which had been emulated throughout the world, was that it provided a national service at a uniform price. Nearly 90 per cent of first-class letters were delivered the following day, 'a better average than anywhere in Europe'. He was sceptical of the service that could be provided by private sector competitors. Mr Silkin said that many of the same considerations applied to the telecommunications monopoly. Its loss would mean a worse service for the majority of people and rural services would be at risk. He agreed with the Secretary of State that telecommunications were the 'spearhead of new technology' but disagreed on the method of developing the industry. Britain had a 'legitimate lead in telecommunications', which should be 'preserved, maintained and improved', but he feared that the Government's policy would put this in jeopardy.

PRESTEL

Plans for implementing Prestel International, the world's first international public viewdata service (which gives users access to information stored in computerised databases and transmitted through the telephone network for display on a suitable television screen in the form of words, figures and simple graphics), were announced on 16 December 1980 by British Telecom (*see footnote*, p 15). This follows the successful outcome of an international market trial (see pp 59-60, 1980) which ran throughout 1980 and involved over 300 prominent business users in seven countries – Australia, Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States – with a trial database of more than 20,000 'pages' of information, provided by over 50 organisations. The Director of Prestel, Mr Richard Hooper, expressed confidence in the attractiveness of the new service to its customers as well as the profitability to British Telecom and its partners.

Prestel international is expected to follow the pattern found to be most successful in the trial, that of providing information, such as shipping movements, investment statistics and commodity prices, for specific business users, and the use of private 'closed user groups' (in which organisations have exclusive use of certain parts of the information bank to meet intra-company needs). It will have a single database, which will be separate from that used for Prestel in Britain. Access to public information on the international database will normally be available to users for the cost of a call on their own country's domestic telephone network. Although access will be possible from anywhere in the world, direct support and marketing will be restricted initially to the seven countries involved in the trial plus Hong Kong. The full international service will be run on a GEC 4080 computer in London and a second GEC computer will be commissioned towards the end of 1981 and located in the United States.

Belgium has recently become the sixth country to buy the technology of the Prestel system; contracts were signed between British Telecom and the Bell Telephone Manufacturing Company (the leading Belgian supplier of telecommunications equipment). The five other countries to have bought the technology are Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hong Kong, the Netherlands and Switzerland.

In Britain there are now some 6,700 users of the Prestel service who can obtain access to over 170,000 'pages' of information on a wide range of subjects supplied by more than 400 'information providers'.

MARITIME SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS

The Council of the International Maritime Satellite Organization (INMARSAT) agreed at a meeting held in London in November 1980 to proceed with a network of satellites to meet the growing international telecommunications needs of the world's shipping and offshore industries during the 1980s. The facilities authorised for lease by INMARSAT are two MARECS satellites of the European Space Agency, three INTELSAT V satellites of the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization (see below) and one MARISAT satellite of the COMSAT General Corporation of the United States. The contracts to the three major suppliers will be worth $180 million over the period 1982-89.

Britain played a major role in the establishment of INMARSAT, which came into existence in July 1979. The purpose of INMARSAT, as set out in its Convention, is 'to make provision for the space segment necessary for improving maritime communications, thereby assisting in improving distress and safety-of-life-at-sea communications, efficiency and management of ships, maritime public correspondence services and radio determination capabilities'. Some 30 signatories to its operating agreement hold investment shares, the largest being the United States with 23·4 per cent, followed by the Soviet Union (14·3 per cent), Britain (9·92 per cent), Norway (7·9 per cent) and Japan (7·02 per cent). INMARSAT's satellite space segment is expected to be operational in early 1982 when it will provide coverage of the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian Ocean areas by means of geostationary satellites in orbit at a height of some 36,000 kilometres (22,400 miles) above the earth. MARISAT coast earth stations in the United States and Japan will continue to operate as part of the new network and should be joined in 1982 by stations in Britain, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Norway and Singapore. (Work on the British station, at Goonhilly Downs in Cornwall, where there are already four aerials, started in October 1980 and is due to be completed by November 1981 in readiness for the aerial to enter service in the summer of 1982.) Further stations are planned. At present about 500 ships are equipped to make use of satellite communications and it is expected that by 1985 some 2,000 vessels will be equipped with terminals and by 1990 some 5,000. Vessels already equipped with terminals and communicating via the MARISAT system (provided by the United States primarily for its navy but on which there is limited capacity for commercial users) will be able to continue to use their terminals when INMARSAT becomes operational. (For further information on the establishment and functions of INMARSAT see COI factel *The International Maritime Satellite Organization*, No 30/Factel/79.)

NEW COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE

The first of the fifth generation of satellites owned by the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization (INTELSAT), providing a substantial increase in the capacity of international telecommunications, was launched from Cape Canaveral in the United States on 6 December 1980. The INTELSAT V satellite can carry up to 12,000 telephone calls and two television channels simultaneously, double the capacity of its predecessors. It has been put into orbit over the Atlantic Ocean to help to meet the continually rising demand for telephone calls between Europe and North America. Conversations between Britain and the United States (amounting to nearly 40 million in 1979, of which 20 million were transmitted by satellite and 19 million by cable) take the biggest share of this traffic and the volume of calls has been rising by over 30 per cent a year.

Britain has the second largest share in INTELSAT which runs a global network of satellites, currently providing about two-thirds of the world's international telecommunications and used by 141 countries operating 295 aerials at 242 earth stations. The INTELSAT network also has 12 satellites of the IV or IVA series. These will eventually be replaced by INTELSAT V satellites, a further eight of which will be launched by 1983. Five of the satellites will include facilities for communications with ships as part of the INMARSAT system. To cope with the growth in demand, each generation of satellites needs to be replaced about every five years; the next generation, INTELSAT VI, providing another large increase in capacity, has been planned and the first is due to be launched in 1986.

DATA COMMUNICATIONS

The start of a national commercial packet switched service (PSS), in which a stream of computer data is sent as a series of self-contained blocks (known as packets), was announced by British Telecom on 7 October 1980.[1] Each packet is routed automatically through the network by means of coded 'address' information given at its start. Among the important features of packet switching are that it provides a flexible and reliable way of linking different computers and terminals, and that it enables a large number of separate terminals to be linked to a computer over a single high-capacity 'highway', so reducing access costs for the computer installations. The PSS is based on a new type of switching centre, known as a packet switching exchange (PSE), and PSEs are being supplied and installed by Plessey Controls Ltd. The service is being introduced in stages,

[1]An experimental service was formally opened in 1977.

with initial operation based on PSEs at London, Reading and Bristol. Early in 1981 the PSS network will start to be extended to the rest of Britain's main centres of population, when PSEs at Birmingham, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Leeds and Manchester are progressively brought into service. The PSS will subsequently give users access to international data links using this form of switching. Initially access will be made available to BT's international packet switched service providing users in Britain with links to the United States, Canada and Spain. There will eventually be a connection to Euronet DIANE, a European Community project to provide access to computerised information via a Community-wide data transmission network, which came into operation early in 1980 (see pp 79-80, 1980).

INTELPOST

Plans for a new public electronic mail service within Britain, to be known as Intelpost, were announced by the Post Office on 20 November 1980. The service, which is to start in the near future, will use advanced facsimile equipment to transmit items such as urgent letters, documents, plans and diagrams between a national network of centres. Initially there will be 15 centres in Britain: in Belfast, Birmingham, Cardiff, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Newcastle upon Tyne, Nottingham, Preston, Sheffield and Southampton. Overseas destinations will be linked to the service by retransmission via London. In June 1980 Intelpost became the world's first international public facsimile transmission service with the inauguration of a link between London and Toronto (see p 224, 1980). Services to the Netherlands are planned and discussions are continuing on establishing links with major cities in the United States.

Industry Bill

An Industry Bill introduced by the Government mainly in order to set new financial limits for public sector investment agencies, including the National Enterprise Board, received an unopposed second reading in the House of Commons on 1 December 1980. The further financing made available by the Bill is chiefly for BL and Rolls-Royce.

The Bill was introduced by the Secretary of State for Industry, Sir Keith Joseph (*Hansard*, Vol 995, No 8, cols 31–45), and contains six clauses.

Clause 1 raises the external financial limits for the National Enterprise Board (NEB) and for Rolls-Royce. In both cases the limits cover private sector financing as well as public money invested in the companies. For the NEB the limits are raised by a token £1 million to £2,251 million, but the Government intends to amend the Bill to provide further funds when it has finished considering BL's 1981 corporate plan. BL accounts for the greater part (£1,500 million) of the NEB's current £2,250 million limit – the rest being for the NEB's other investments. The clause also increases the funds which the Secretary of State for Industry may authorise for Rolls-Royce (control of the company having passed from the NEB to the Secretary of State in August 1980) from £750 million to £1,500 million, with provision for a further increase by Order up to £2,000 million. The new limits reflect the company's external financing requirement for the next five years. The aggregate limits for the NEB and Rolls-Royce are therefore increased from £3,000 million at present to £4,251 million, with a further increase intended when a firm figure has been decided for BL.

Clause 2 of the Bill increases the financial limits of the Scottish Development Agency (SDA) from £500 million to £700 million, of the Welsh Development Agency (WDA) from £250 million to £450 million and of the Development Board for Rural Wales from £40 million to £100 million. The increases are intended to provide adequate cover for the activities of these bodies over the next five years.

Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill are intended to establish a new capital base for the NEB, the SDA and the WDA to reflect their changed roles under the Industry Act 1980 (see pp 339–40, 1979, and pp 27 and 300, 1980). The Bill therefore reduces the public dividend capital[1] of all three bodies (by £32·4 million, £7 million and £2·7 million, respectively), and reduces the government loan debts of the SDA and WDA by amounts (£2 million and £1 million, respectively) corresponding to irrecoverable losses on past investments.

The two other provisions in the Bill relate to other topics. Clause 5 empowers the Secretary of State for Industry to prolong, by Order, from four to six years the period of operation of redundancy schemes run by British Shipbuilders and Harland and Wolff. Clause 6 empowers the Secretary of State for Industry to guarantee loans to, or make grants available to, the proposed body to be established by Royal Charter to promote the engineering profession (see p 253, 1980). It also provides statutory cover for loans made by the Department of Industry to help to improve links between industrial and educational institutions and to encourage people to take up careers in industry.

Shorter Notes

HEAVY GOODS VEHICLES AND THE ENVIRONMENT

An increase in the maximum permitted weights of goods vehicles, and higher taxes on the heaviest of these vehicles, are among the main recommendations of a report to the Minister of (now Secretary of State for) Transport on lorries and the environment, produced by Sir Arthur Armitage

[1]Public dividend capital is a form of non-repayable long-term finance for public corporations, analogous to equity capital and earning dividends for the Government rather than interest.

(a former Vice-Chancellor of Manchester University) with the assistance of four expert assessors and published on 9 December 1980.[1] Sir Arthur's terms of reference were to consider the causes and consequences of the growth in the movement of freight by road and, in particular, of the impact of the lorry on people and their environment, and to report on the best way of ensuring that future development served the public interest. In a statement on the report, Sir Arthur said that the recommendations were necessary on economic grounds, bringing large cost savings, and would give greatly increased protection to the environment and to the public.

The report notes some of the main developments in road haulage including the growing importance of road freight, which accounted for 65 per cent of ton-mileage covered in Britain in 1979 compared with 36 per cent in 1953, and a trend towards the use of heavier lorries. However, it finds that lorries do too much damage to the environment through intrusion, noise and the emission of fumes, and affect some places, such as historic and other towns and villages on major routes, particularly badly. Accordingly, it makes a number of recommendations, such as the introduction of new controls on the size of goods vehicles; very large reductions in the maximum noise limit for lorries; more by-passes of towns and villages on major routes; the identification of 'lorry action areas' (areas in need of help because of nuisance from lorries) where special subsidies could be paid for, among other things, noise insulation and better road surfaces; improvements in lorry safety; and an increase in the level of grants payable to companies (other than British Rail) towards the cost of installing rail sidings and providing rolling stock. The report recommends that taxation on lorries in general, and on each class of lorry, should be at least equal to the road track costs they impose. At present the vehicle excise duty on the heaviest lorries is such that they do not meet all their allocated road track costs and the report suggests that the balance of taxation should be shifted from the lightest to the more damaging heaviest lorries. It recommends increases in the maximum permitted weight from 32 tons (32·5 tonnes) for articulated lorries to 34 tonnes for four-axle articulated lorries and up to 44 tonnes for six-axle lorries. If these heavier lorries were introduced, they would replace a larger number of existing heavy lorries and produce substantial savings in transport costs, possibly amounting to some £120 million to £130 million a year now and £170 million to £190 million a year by 1990. The recommendation for the increases is subject to the heavier lorries being no bigger than existing lorries, being safer, creating less noise, doing no more damage to bridges and roads, and leading to an improvement in the environmental effects of lorries. The report says that all these criteria can be satisfied by adopting the recommended maximum gross weights and axle weights, and the heavier lorries in most cases will cause less road damage than existing lorries.

[1] *Report of the Inquiry into Lorries, People and the Environment.* HMSO, £8·50. ISBN 0 11 550536 9.

FAMILY EXPENDITURE SURVEY 1979

The *Family Expenditure Survey 1979*[1] was published by the Department of Employment in December 1980. The survey is the latest in an annual series and gives details of household expenditure and income. It also discusses such subjects as the size and composition of households, their type of accommodation and their ownership of durable goods. As well as giving information for 1979 the survey examines changes over time.

After allowing for the rise of 13·4 per cent in retail prices, average weekly expenditure per household increased by some 3 per cent between 1978 and 1979, to reach £94·17. Expenditure per person averaged £34·85 a week. Average gross weekly income per household was £120·45 which, after deductions of income tax and national insurance, left a disposable income of just under £100, 14 per cent more than in 1978.

Expenditure varied considerably according to the size and composition of households. As the number of adults in a household increased, the number of workers and levels of income and expenditure also tended to rise. At the bottom of the expenditure range are households of retired people mainly dependent on state pensions. Their average size in 1979 was 1·35 persons, with average weekly expenditure of just over £31, or £23 per person. At the top of the range were households comprising at least four adults and one child (an average household size of six persons with 3·72 workers), which spent on average almost £200 a week, or over £33 per person. Average weekly expenditure in those households whose gross normal weekly income was in the lowest 20 per cent was only 37 per cent of the average, compared with 175 per cent in households whose income was in the top 20 per cent.

The composition of household expenditure varied considerably according to the level of income. As income increased the proportion spent on, for example, durable goods and transport and vehicles rose sharply while there was a pronounced fall in the proportion spent on housing, fuel and food.

The survey analyses regional differences in expenditure for the two-year period 1978–79. Among the findings are that average weekly household expenditure ranged from £78·54 in Yorkshire and Humberside to £97·47 in Greater London. The average for Britain was £87·16. Expenditure on transport and vehicles in Greater London was 14 per cent above the average, mainly on account of the large amount spent on railway fares. Expenditure on food in Greater London was also above the average because of the larger number of meals bought outside the home.

Between 1953–54 (data for which are taken from the report of the Enquiry into Household Expenditure) and 1979 the proportion of household expenditure devoted to housing rose from 8·8 per cent to 14·6 per cent while that spent on transport and vehicles nearly doubled, from 7 per cent to 13·9 per cent. There were substantial falls

[1] HMSO. £10·50. ISBN 0 11 361195 1.

in the proportions spent on food and on tobacco (from 33·3 per cent to 23·2 per cent and from 6·6 per cent to 3 per cent, respectively).

In 1979 the average household consisted of 2·7 persons with an average of 1·33 workers. Fifty-two per cent of households either owned or were buying their own homes, 45 per cent lived in rented accommodation (almost three-quarters of them being tenants of local authorities) and 3 per cent lived rent-free. Ninety-six per cent of households had a television, 93 per cent a refrigerator, 77 per cent a washing machine, 58 per cent one car or more and 55 per cent full or partial central heating. None of these characteristics of household composition, accommodation or ownership of durable goods had changed significantly since 1978. The only major change concerned the renting of telephones, which rose from 62 per cent of households in 1978 to 67 per cent in 1979.

TAXATION OF HUSBAND AND WIFE

The Government has invited views on a consultative document, *The Taxation of Husband and Wife*,[1] published in December 1980. This examines the treatment of married couples under the present tax system and the criticisms to which this has given rise, and considers possible changes and the effects which they would have.

At present a married couple is usually taxed as a single unit. The incomes of husband and wife are added together and tax is charged, subject to any allowances, on the total as if it were a single income. The husband is legally responsible for the couple's tax affairs and deals with the tax authorities. The married man's allowance is £2,145, compared with £1,375 for a single person. The husband whose wife works also receives the wife's earned income allowance which is set against her earned income (but not her investment income) and is equal to the single person's allowance or the amount of her earnings, whichever is the less. The normal rules can be varied by choosing 'separate assessment' or 'wife's earnings election' or both. Under separate assessment the total tax due from a couple is unchanged but the allowances are apportioned between the husband and wife in proportion to their individual incomes. Separate assessment secures for the wife the right to handle her tax affairs independently and releases the husband from the responsibility for paying the tax due on his wife's income. Under wife's earnings election the wife receives the single person's allowance (which takes the place of the wife's earned income allowance) against her earned income, with the husband also receiving the single person's allowance instead of the married man's allowance. Any investment income the wife may have continues to be regarded as belonging to her husband for tax purposes. This system is advantageous when the couple's total income and the wife's earnings are of such a size that the loss of the married man's allowance is outweighed by the reduction in tax payable at the higher rates.

The consultative document discusses two major changes which could be made within the present system: independent taxation of wife's income and separate responsibility with equal division of allowances. Independent taxation of wife's income differs from separate assessment in that husband and wife would each receive the single person's allowance. As under separate assessment in the wife rather than the husband would be taxed on her investment income, but, unlike separate assessment, this method would not allow one partner to deduce the size of the other's income. Under separate responsibility with equal division of allowances all the wife's income, including investment income, would again be taxed separately from the husband's. Total allowances, although the same under separate assessment, would be divided equally between the two partners instead of in proportion to their individual incomes. The consultative document points out that the changes discussed would give wives as well as husbands increased privacy regarding their tax affairs.

Implications of switching to a system of mandatory individual taxation are explored. Under such a system the married man's allowance would disappear and husbands and wives would each receive the same allowance as single taxpayers. For cases where one partner had little or no income so that the allowance could not be fully used the possibility of complete or partial transferability of the allowance to the supporting partner is considered. The consultative document also examines the possibility of providing for the dependent partner through a cash benefit; this would ensure that the help went direct to the supported partner and that those whose incomes were below the tax threshold, so that they did not gain from a tax allowance, would also benefit. However, the Government favours a transferable tax allowance over a cash benefit.

OIL AND GAS LICENSING

The provisional award of 42 offshore petroleum production licences, the first to be made under the seventh round of offshore licensing, was announced by the Minister of State at the Department of Energy, Mr Hamish Gray, in the House of Commons on 16 December 1980 (*Hansard*, Vol 996, No 19, written answers, col 125). All of these licences are in the area of the North Sea designated by the Department of Energy where companies were invited to make applications for blocks of their own choice (see p 168, 1980) and for each of which the licensees will have to make an initial payment of £5 million, bringing in a total initial revenue of £210 million. The awards have been made to 29 applicant groups, representing over 80 companies, including 39 British firms of which seven (including four of the smaller oil companies) will be among the operators for the

[1]Cmnd 8093. HMSO, £4·20. ISBN 0 10 180930 1.

blocks. Provisional awards for blocks designated by the Department of Energy in other areas of the United Kingdom Continental Shelf are expected to be announced early in 1981.

The award of seven onshore petroleum production licences was announced by the Secretary of State for Energy, Mr David Howell, on 18 November 1980. Apart from two awards in July 1979 and January 1980, these are the first onshore production licences to be issued since the end of 1971. Recently there has been growing interest in onshore oil and gas prospects, reflected by a considerable amount of survey work under existing exploration licences and the drilling of a number of exploration wells under existing production licences.

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Television

New contracts to provide programmes for the independent television network were offered by the Independent Broadcasting Authority (IBA) on 28 December 1980. The contracts will run for eight years from January 1982, and for the first time a contract to provide early morning ('breakfast-time') television from 1983 has been offered.

New Contracts Offered

In January 1980 the IBA published its specifications for the new franchises to run from January 1982 when the contracts awarded in 1968 expire. It introduced two new 'dual areas' (where a single contractor may broadcast different programmes to reflect regional interests within a single franchise area) and also invited applications for a 'breakfast-time' franchise. Thirty-seven companies or groups applied for the fifteen franchises offered for renewal, and eight for the 'breakfast-time' franchise.

Three existing contractors (Border Television Ltd, Channel Television Ltd and Grampian Television Ltd) had their contracts renewed unopposed. Ten of the twelve other franchises were offered to the existing contractors (Anglia Television Ltd, ATV Network Ltd, Granada Television Ltd, HTV Ltd, London Weekend Television Ltd, Scottish Television Ltd, Thames Television Ltd, Tyne-Tees Television Ltd, Ulster Television Ltd, and Yorkshire Television Ltd). In a number of cases, however, the IBA made certain stipulations about the internal organisation of the companies, and in others general recommendations were made about programme content. The two franchises for south-west England and the new dual area of south and south-east England, previously held by Westward Television Ltd and Southern Television Ltd, were offered to new companies—Television South-West Ltd and TV South (South and South-East Communications) Ltd, respectively.

In offering a 'breakfast-time' franchise the IBA concluded that the service should begin in 1983 and that it would decide on the exact starting date after discussion with the appointed company, TV-AM Ltd. The IBA's decision to delay the start of the service was taken in view of the establishment of the Fourth Channel planned for late 1982 (see pp 84-6 and p 373, 1980) and the impact this might have on company revenues in the first few months of the franchise.

BBC Early Morning Television

The BBC has announced that a working party has been set up and will report in early 1981 on the feasibility of providing an early morning television service. A short pilot trial scheme in which early morning radio programmes were televised was carried out in Scotland in late 1980.

DOCUMENTATION

Government and Administration

Statistics of the Criminal Justice System: England and Wales 1969-79. Brings together the principal statistics on the criminal justice system over the last decade. HMSO, £5·80. ISBN 0 11 340735 1.

External Affairs and Defence

The British Council Annual Report 1979-80. British Council/HMSO, £1·20. ISBN 0 901618 33 0,

Economic and Scientific Affairs

Government Observations upon the First Report from the Committee on Welsh Affairs. The document contains detailed comments on some 35 points raised by the Committee. While sharing the Committee's underlying concern about unemployment, the Government is unable to accept all the findings of the report. In particular, the additional public expenditure recommended by the Committee, would, says the document, seriously prejudice the reduction of public sector borrowing which is essential to general economic recovery. The Government also believes that there is little evidence to substantiate the Committee's finding that Wales faces the threat of serious social disorder. Cmnd 8085. HMSO, £2·40. ISBN 0 10 180850 X.

Family Expenditure Survey 1979 (see p 19). HMSO, £10·50. ISBN 0 11 361195 1.

The Taxation of Husband and Wife (see p 20). Cmnd 8093. HMSO, £4·20. ISBN 0 10 180930 1.

Welsh Local Government Financial Statistics No 4, 1980. HMSO, £11. ISBN 0 11 790141 5.

Royal Mint. Annual Report 1980. The report shows that in the year ended 31 March 1980 the Royal Mint Trading Fund had British sales of £28 million and overseas sales of £42 million. Available free from the Royal Mint, 7 Grosvenor Gardens, London SW1W 0BH.

Registry of Friendly Societies. Report of the Chief Registrar 1979. HMSO, £4·50. ISBN 0 11 600310 3.

Proposed Action by Her Majesty's Government on two Conventions and two Recommendations at the 65th Session (1979) of the International Labour Conference and a Convention adopted at the 55th (Maritime) Session (1970) of the International Labour Conference. The Government intends to ratify the Convention on crew accommodation. The question of dockers' safety has been referred to the Health and Safety Commission for advice. Action on the Convention and Recommendation on drivers' hours will depend on decisions to be taken by the European Community. Cmnd 8118. HMSO, £3. ISBN 0 10 181180 2.

Code of Practice: Closed Shop Agreements and Arrangements and *Code of Practice: Picketing* (see p 271, 1980). Available free from Enquiry Office, Department of Employment, Caxton House, Tothill Street, London SW1H 9NA.

Foundries: Health and Safety 1975-78. Health and Safety Executive. HMSO, £2. ISBN 0 11 883277 8.

Health and Safety: Quarries 1979. Health and Safety Executive. HMSO, £3·50. ISBN 0 11 883298 0.

Standing Commission on Pay Comparability. Report No 12: New Towns Staff. Cmnd 8109. HMSO, £2·10. ISBN 0 10 181090 3.

Agricultural Research Council. Annual Report 1979-80. HMSO, £8·80. ISBN 0 10 200381 5.

Forestry Commission. Sixtieth Annual Report and Accounts 1979-80. HMSO, £7·20. ISBN 0 10 201481 7.

Scientific Aspects of Forestry. House of Lords Select Committee on Science and Technology.

Vol I, Report. HMSO, £3·60. ISBN 0 10 044579 9.

Vol II, Minutes of Evidence. HMSO, £9·90. ISBN 0 10 044569 1.

Transport Statistics Great Britain 1969-79. HMSO, £18·50. ISBN 0 11 550533 4.

Report of the Inquiry into Lorries, People and the Environment (see p 18). HMSO, £8·50. ISBN 0 11 550536 9.

The Roads Programme. First Report from the House of Commons Transport Committee.

Vol I. Report, Minutes of Proceedings and Appendices. HMSO, £4·60. ISBN 0 10 270281 0.

Vol II. Minutes of Evidence. HMSO, £6·30. ISBN 0 10 270381 7.

Railway Accidents: Report on the Safety Record of the Railways in Great Britain during the year 1979. Department of Transport. HMSO, £7. ISBN 0 11 550534 2.

Social Science Research Council. Annual Report 1979-80. HMSO, £3·60. ISBN 0 10 202181 3.

Social and Cultural Affairs

Social Trends No 11, 1981. Prepared by the Central Statistical Office with statistics on population, social and economic characteristics, health and social services, housing, transport, finance, justice and crime. HMSO, £16·50. ISBN 0 11 630773 0.

Criminal Injuries Compensation Board. Sixteenth Report. Accounts for the Year Ended 31st March 1980. Cmnd 8081. HMSO, £3·70. ISBN 0 10 180810 0.

A Strategy for Social Security Operations. A working paper setting out the possibilities for changes in the methods of paying social security benefits and discussing the new technology which would be needed. Available from Department of Health and Social Security (Leaflets), PO Box 21, Stanmore, Middlesex HA7 1AR. £2.

Mental Handicap: Progress, Problems and Priorities. A review of the development of services for the mentally handicapped in England since the 1971 White Paper 'Better Services for the Mentally Handicapped'. Available free from Department of Health and Social Security, Alexander Fleming House, Elephant and Castle, London SE1 6BY.

The Government's Reply to the First Report from the [House of Commons] *Environment Committee.* Includes a brief statement of the Government's housing policy. Cmnd 8105. HMSO, £1·10. ISBN 0 10 181050 4.

Urban Renaissance: A better life in towns. Report on United Kingdom Urban Policies. By Alun Sylvester-Evans. HMSO, £5. ISBN 0 11 751489 6.

Third Report of the Home Office Local Radio Working Party. Sets out proposals put forward by the British Broadcasting Corporation and the Independent Broadcasting Authority for the future development of BBC and Independent Local Radio. Comments are invited before the Government announces its decision on the proposals. Available free from The Secretary, Home Office Local Radio Working Party, Home Office, 50 Queen Anne's Gate, London SW1.

© *Crown Copyright 1981*

Printed in England by Brown Knight & Truscott Ltd
and Published by
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
£1.20p net

Annual subscription including indices and postage £18.60

H2705 Dd 8202100 K8 JANUARY/81 1980
ISBN 0 11 726384 2 Vol. 11 No. 1
ISSN 0039—6214